

**From:** Shawn Garvin/R3/USEPA/US  
**Sent:** 1/21/2012 10:26:44 AM  
**To:** Jon Capacasa  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Re: Cabot Statement

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative

**From:** Jon Capacasa  
**Sent:** 01/21/2012 08:55 AM EST  
**To:** Shawn Garvin  
**Subject:** Re: Cabot Statement

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative

**From:** Shawn Garvin  
**Sent:** 01/20/2012 11:25 PM EST  
**To:** Kathy Hodgkiss; Michael Kulik; Terri-A White; Roy Seneca; Joan Schafer; Jon Capacasa; Dennis Carney; KarenD Johnson; Humane Zia; Cecil Rodrigues  
**Subject:** Re: Cabot Statement  
Thanks. I am also interested on when we received the information.  
Have a good weekend.

**From:** Kathy Hodgkiss  
**Sent:** 01/20/2012 10:38 PM EST  
**To:** Shawn Garvin; Michael Kulik; Terri-A White; Roy Seneca; Joan Schafer; Jon Capacasa; Dennis Carney; KarenD Johnson; Humane Zia; Cecil Rodrigues  
**Subject:** Re: Cabot Statement  
Cabot replied to a recent 104(e) letter, submitting its response on a CD. Not sure how many pages. Sending this to Humane and Karen Johnson who may have some sense of the size of the reply.

**From:** Shawn Garvin  
**Sent:** 01/20/2012 09:02 PM EST  
**To:** Michael Kulik; Betsaida Alcantara; Brendan Gilfillan; Terri-A White; Kathy Hodgkiss; Roy Seneca; Joan Schafer; Jon Capacasa; Dennis Carney  
**Subject:** Re: Cabot Statement  
Jon, Kathy & Dennis - Can you give me an answer to statement that Cabot has given us over 10K pages of data.  
Thanks - Shawn

**From:** Michael Kulik  
**Sent:** 01/20/2012 08:18 PM EST  
**To:** Betsaida Alcantara; Brendan Gilfillan; Shawn Garvin; Terri-A White; Kathy Hodgkiss; Roy Seneca; Joan Schafer  
**Subject:** Fw: Cabot Statement  
Here it is  
to -----\Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services.

**From:** Michael Kulik [michaelkulik@msn.com]  
**Sent:** 01/20/2012 08:15 PM EST  
**To:** Michael Kulik  
**Subject:** Cabot Statement

### Four Points on EPA Sampling Decision at Dimock, PA

Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation and others look forward to continuing our efforts to coordinate with the Dimock community and with state and federal regulators to address concerns regarding shale development in the area. We are disappointed that the federal EPA has undertaken a course regarding water sampling that seems inconsistent with what is known about Dimock and what was recommended by state regulators. EPA's zig-zag approach has caused confusion that undermines

important policy goals of the United States to ensure safe, reliable, secure and clean energy sources from domestic natural gas.

Here are four important points to consider:

- EPA has presented no credible evidence to suggest that its new sampling initiative is a wise use of resources given the collection and analysis of over 2000 water wells that has already occurred in the area. More than ten thousands pages of this data have been provided to EPA.
- EPA's concerns are inconsistent with the findings of state regulators who have concluded after extensive investigation that Dimock drinking water meets regulatory standards. State regulators are closest to the facts, and most familiar with ground water and geological formations in the area.
- EPA's initiative marks a change in position for the Agency, unsupported by any new facts. As recently as December 2011, EPA told Dimock residents that their drinking water did not present a health threat.
- What is needed is an objective approach to dealing with community concerns - something missing in recent EPA actions. EPA's changing posture on sampling in

2

Dimock is indicative of a broader problem of inconsistency with scientific process and a lack of cooperation with state and private sector parties. Cabot hopes that we can work with EPA to further review existing data and to establish a firmer basis for Agency decision making.